



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	
	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 1:07-CR-198
	§	
BRANDY SHANTHA SPRINGER	§	

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PLEA OF TRUE
BEFORE THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and the Local Rules for the District Court, Eastern District of Texas, the District Court referred this matter for hearing and the submission of findings of fact and a report and recommendation pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3401(i) and 3583(e). The United States alleges that Defendant, Brandy Shantha Springer, violated conditions of supervised release imposed by United States District Judge Thad Heartfield. The United States Probation Office filed its *Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision* (doc. #62) requesting the revocation of the defendant's supervised release

The Court conducted a hearing on January 2, 2013, in accordance with Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 11, 32 and 32.1. Defendant was present and represented by counsel at the hearing. Having heard the evidence, this court factually finds that the defendant has violated conditions of supervision and recommends that such violation warrants the revocation of her supervised release.

After conducting the proceeding in the form and manner prescribed by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11, the Court finds:

a. That Defendant, after consultation with counsel of record, has knowingly, freely and voluntarily consented to the administration of the plea of true in this cause by a United States Magistrate Judge subject to a final approval and imposition of sentence by the District Court.

b. That Defendant is fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea, that Defendant is aware of the nature of the charges and the consequences of the plea, that her plea of true is a knowing and voluntary plea, not the result of force or threats, and that the plea is supported by an independent evidentiary basis in fact establishing each of the essential elements of the conduct.

STATEMENT OF REASONS

A. Procedural History

On September 9, 2008, The Honorable Thad Heartfield, United States District Judge, sentenced Brandy Shantha Springer after she pled guilty to the offense of possession with intent to distribute 500 grams or more but less than 5 kilograms of cocaine HCL, a Class B felony. Judge Heartfield sentenced the defendant to 60 months and 1 day imprisonment followed by four (4) years of supervised release subject to the standard conditions of release, plus special conditions to include drug treatment and a \$100 special assessment. On October 19, 2010, the District Court reduced Springer's sentence to 30 months imprisonment. On December 16, 2010, the defendant completed her period of imprisonment and began service of the supervision term.

B. Allegations in Petition

The United States alleges that the defendant violated the following standard condition of supervised release:

The defendant shall not leave the judicial district without permission of the Court or probation officer.

Ms. Springer did not have permission from her probation officer to be in Harris County, Texas, on February 18, 2012.

C. Evidence presented at Hearing

At the hearing, the Government proffered the following evidence as its factual basis for the allegations set out *supra*. The Government would prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Ms. Springer was placed on supervised release and, as part of her supervision conditions, she was directed not to leave the judicial district without the permission of her probation officer. The Government would offer evidence and testimony establishing that on February 18, 2012, Brandy Shantha Springer was arrested by the Houston Police Department in Harris County, Texas, which is outside of the Eastern District of Texas. Testimony would further establish that she did not receive the permission of her probation officer to be in Harris County outside of this judicial district.

Defendant, Brandy Shantha Springer, offered a plea of true to the allegations. Specifically, she agreed with the evidence presented and pled true to the allegation that she left the judicial district without permission in violation of her supervision conditions.

D. Sentencing Guidelines; Findings and Recommended Disposition

The allegations, supporting evidence and plea of true warrant revocation of supervised release. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3). The Court factually finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant violated a standard condition of her supervised release by leaving the judicial district without permission.

A violation of her supervision conditions in the manner stated above constitutes a Grade C violation under U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a). Upon finding a Grade C violation, the Court shall revoke the defendant's supervised release. *See* U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(a)(1). Based upon the defendant's criminal history category of III and the Grade C violation, the Sentencing Guidelines suggest a sentence of imprisonment for a period ranging from 5 to 11 months. *See* U.S.S.G. § 7B1.4(a). Because the original offense of conviction was a Class B felony, the statutory maximum imprisonment term upon revocation is three years. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3).

The Fifth Circuit states that Chapter 7 of the Sentencing Guidelines regarding the revocation of supervised release is advisory only. *See United States v. Cade*, 279 F.3d 265, 271 n.2 (5th Cir. 2002) (citing *United States v. Montez*, 952 F.2d 854, 859 (5th Cir. 1992); *United States v. Headrick*, 963 F.2d 777, 782 (5th Cir. 1992)). Because Chapter 7 was promulgated as an advisory policy statement and there are no applicable guidelines for sentencing after revocation of supervised release¹, the Court may impose a greater or lesser sentence upon revocation. *United States v. Gonzalez*, 250 F.3d 923, 925 (5th Cir. 2001). Further, a sentence imposed for revocation will be upheld unless it is in violation of the law or plainly unreasonable. *Id.* *See also United States v.*

¹ *See U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual*, Ch. 7, pt. A, cmt. 1 ("At this time, the Commission has chosen to promulgate policy statements only.")

Pena, 125 F.3d 285, 288 (5th Cir. 1997) (citations omitted).

Here, the evidence and the defendant's own admission supports a finding that she violated her supervision conditions. The Court, therefore, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant committed a Grade C violation of her supervision conditions by using a controlled substance. The defendant knowingly and voluntarily pled true and agreed with the Court's recommended sentence for the violation.


Accordingly, based upon the defendant's plea of true, the agreement of the parties, and the evidence presented in this case, it is the recommendation of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge that the District Court accept the plea of true and revoke the defendant's supervised release. The undersigned magistrate judge further recommends that the District Court order Defendant, Brandy Shantha Springer, to serve a term of **five (5) months imprisonment** with no further supervision to follow in this case.

OBJECTIONS

Objections must be: (1) specific, (2) in writing, and (3) served and filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of this report. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party's failure to object bars that party from: (1) entitlement to *de novo* review by a district judge of proposed findings and recommendations, *see Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988), and (2) appellate review, except on grounds of plain error of unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court, *see Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n.*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc). The constitutional safeguards afforded by Congress and the courts require that, when a party takes advantage of his right to object to a magistrate's findings or recommendation, a district judge must exercise its nondelegable authority by considering the actual

evidence and not merely by reviewing and blindly adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation. *See Hernandez v. Estelle*, 711 F.2d 619, 620 (5th Cir. 1983); *United States v. Elsoffer*, 644 F.2d 357, 359 (5th Cir. 1981) (per curiam).

SIGNED this the 7th day of January, 2013.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Keith F. GIBLIN", written over a horizontal line.

KEITH F. GIBLIN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE